

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

N A MAHALAKSHMI SRINIVASAN,	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
v.	§	No. 3:24-CV-2292-B-BW
	§	
NCH CORPORATION,	§	
Defendant.	§	Referred to U.S. Magistrate Judge ¹

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

On December 20, 2024, Plaintiff N A Mahalakshmi, appearing pro se, filed a document requesting “protection to all my siblings, their families, and me in India, Singapore, USA, [and] Dubai at the earliest possible.” (Dkt. No. 13.) Construing the filing as a motion for temporary restraining order under Fed. R. Civ. P. 65, the undersigned magistrate judge recommended on January 10, 2025, that the motion be denied. (Dkt. No. 19.) That recommendation was accepted on January 28, 2025. (Dkt. No. 21.)

On February 3, 2025, Plaintiff filed a one-page document titled as a “Request to reconsider the request for protection[.]” (Dkt. No. 26.) Construing Plaintiff’s filing as a motion to reconsider or to renew its request for a temporary restraining order under Fed. R. Civ. P. 65, the undersigned concludes it should be denied for the same reasons cited in the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the

¹ United States District Judge Jane J. Boyle referred this action to the undersigned magistrate judge for pretrial management pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). (Dkt. No. 18.)

United States Magistrate Judge entered on January 10. (*See* Dkt. No. 19.) Plaintiff's renewed filing does not provide any more information about the precise relief sought from the Court, nor does it address any of the elements Plaintiff must establish to obtain a TRO. (*See* Dkt. No. 19 (citing *Women's Med. Ctr. of Northeast Houston v. Bell*, 248 F.3d 411, 418-20 (5th Cir. 2011)).)

The undersigned recommends that Plaintiff's motion to reconsider the denial of her motion for protective order (Dkt. No. 26) be **DENIED**.

SO RECOMMENDED on February 11, 2025.



BRIAN MCKAY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE AND
NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL/OBJECT**

A copy of this report and recommendation will be served on all parties in the manner provided by law. Any party who objects to any part of this report and recommendation must file specific written objections within 14 days after being served with a copy. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). To be specific, an objection must identify the finding or recommendation to which objection is made, state the basis for the objection, and indicate the place in the magistrate judge's report and recommendation where the disputed determination is found. An objection that merely incorporates by reference or refers to the briefing before the magistrate judge is not specific. Failure to file specific written objections will bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge that are accepted or adopted by the district court, except upon grounds of plain error. *See Douglass v. United Services Automobile Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996), *modified by statute on other grounds*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections to 14 days).